

REMARKS**STATUS OF CLAIMS**

Claims 1-39 were previously pending.

Claims 1, 5-7, 15, 29, and 34 have been amended, claims 3-4, 17, 22-28, and 38-39 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and no new claims have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-2, 5-16, 18-21, and 29-37 are pending and are submitted for reconsideration.

It should be noted that claims 5-7 and 34 have been amended for formal reasons and these amendments do not narrow these claims in any way.

REJECTION UNDER 35 USC § 102

In the final office action, claims 1-39 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102 as anticipated by Reeves (US. Patent Number 6,748,402). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection with respect to the pending claims for at least the following reasons.

As acknowledged in the office action, claim 4 recites subject matter that is patentable over the art of record. The features of claim 4 have been added to independent claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is in *prima facie* condition for allowance.

In addition, features similar to that recited in claim 4 have been added to independent claims 15 and 29. Accordingly, these claims are also in condition for allowance for reasons that are similar to that for the indicated allowability of claim 4. Therefore, all the pending independent claims are now in condition for allowance based on subject matter indicated as being allowable in the office action.

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/693,175
Attorney Docket Number: 306230.01
Filing Date: 10/23/2003

DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The dependent claims are deemed to be patentable at least based on their dependence from allowable independent claims. In addition, they recite patentable subject matter when considered as a whole. For example, the feature recited in claims 11 and 18 (the conversion is performed by a generalized process designed to convert identity information into multiple different formats) is also not disclosed by Reeves and this provides an additional reason for the patentability of this claim.

In this context it should be noted that in order for a reference to be utilized as an anticipatory reference under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 102, the reference must disclose each and every claimed element. This is certainly not the case here, and thus the Sec. 102 rejection as to claims 11 and 18 must be withdrawn since the specific features recited in these claims are not disclosed.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance and an indication of the same is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the Applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below.

If this Amendment is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this Response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,
Microsoft Corporation

Date: 14 August 2006

Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052

By: Aaron C. Chatterjee

Aaron C. Chatterjee
Reg. No. 41,398
Attorney for Applicants
Direct telephone (703) 647-6572

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION
(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

August 14, 2006
Date

Noemi Toavar
Noemi Toavar

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/693,175
Attorney Docket Number: 306230.01
Filing Date: 10/23/2003